

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

By this Amendment, Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58 and cancelled claims 12, 24, 28, 32, 39, 42, 44, 49, 54, 57 & 59. The amended claims incorporate subject matter of the cancelled claims. Additional support for the claim changes may be found in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 11 to 25; page 13, lines 10 to 16, page 14, lines 21 to 32; and FIGs. 4 & 11.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55, 56, 58 & 60-65 will be pending in the subject application.

Telephone Interview

At the outset, Applicant's representative wishes to thank the Examiner for granting an telephone interview on November 10, 2008. In the interview, the Examiner clarified his rejections and arguments made in the Office Action. However, no agreement was reached with respect to the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections

Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 5,774,729 to *Carney et al.* ("*Carney*") cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) because the patent does not teach or suggest all the features recited in the claim.

Carney discloses a method for handling events in a computer system that occur during the execution of programs having routines prepared in a plurality of computer programming languages. (*Carney*, Col. 1:59-63.) A event handler is initialized for each computer programming language. (*Id.* at Col. 1:65-67.) Events of interest to the event handlers are detected and parameters associated with the selected event are determined. (*Id.* at Cols. 1:66-2:2.)

Events may be divided into two types: broadcast or targeted, wherein broadcast events are sent to all event handlers and targeted events are sent to a single event handler. (*Id.* at Col. 2:3-7.) An event code is passed to the event handlers so that each can perform an appropriate for that event in the context of the programming language being supported. (*Id.* at Col. 2:7-11.)

More specifically, *Carney* provides an event handling unit 11 that interfaces an application program 12 with event handlers 13-15. (*Id.* at Col. 4:1-5; FIG. 1.) When a relevant event is detected by an event detector, an event handler interface unit 24 in event handling unit 11 gathers the needed parameters and passes them along with an event code which identifies the type of event to one or more event handlers 13-15. (*Id.* at Col. 4:27-31; FIG. 2.) When a defined event occurs, the event handler unit 11 makes a number of determinations to route the event to the correct event handlers 13-15. (*Id.* at Col. 4:41-60.) The type of the event determines whether the event should be broadcast to event handlers 13-15 or targeted to a single event handler. (*Id.*)

The Examiner apparently asserts that *Carney's* "types" correspond to the claimed "routing types." However in *Carney*, event handling unit (EHU) 11 determines the types *based on parameters it gathers*. (*Id.* at Col. 7:40-54; Table I; Col. 4:27-31.) For instance, event handling unit (EHU) 11 can examine information (e.g., a member number) in the program prologue area (PPA) of the routine in which the event occurred. (*Id.* at Col. 7:47-54.)

EHU 11 does not determine a "type" based on "an event specifying an assigned routing type," as recited in claim 1. Indeed, *Carney* says nothing with regard to "receiving an event *specifying an assigned routing type*" and "determining a routing mechanism for the received event *based on the specified routing type*," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

Because *Carney* does not disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1, the patent cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under Sections 102 or 103. Claim 1 is, therefore, allowable over *Carney*.

Independent claims 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58, although of different scope than claim 1, recite features similar to the above-noted features of claim 1. Accordingly, *Carney* cannot support a rejection of claim 1 for at least the same reasons given above. Claims 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58 are, therefore, allowable over *Carney*, as well.

Dependent claims 2-11, 14-23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 47, 48, 51-53, 56 & 60-65 are also allowable at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 1, 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the applied reference. Applicant, therefore, requests entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, the pending placing claims in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed claim changes do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner since all the features were earlier claimed and examined. Therefore, this amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, as pointed out above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Final Office Action presented many new arguments and evidence. (See Office Action, pp. 6-10.) Thus entry of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that entry of this Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

If additional fees are required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4800 the necessary amount.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 14, 2008

By: /Steven Ashburn/
Steven L. Ashburn
Registration No. 56,636

Customer No. 21839